

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM



RELOCATION ANALYSIS

ST. LOUIS

Technical Report

on a

RELOCATION ANALYSIS

for

St. Louis, Missouri

One of a series of Community Renewal
Program technical background reports
to provide a basis for a

ST. LOUIS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Prepared for the
St. Louis City Plan Commission
by
Center for Urban Programs
St. Louis University
3617 Lindell
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

February 1972

Foreword

The Center for Urban Programs at Saint Louis University entered into a contract with the City of Saint Louis acting by and through the Saint Louis City Plan Commission to carry out a Relocation Study as per Project No. 4-2 of the Saint Louis CRP Study Design. The objective of the study was to provide estimates of relocation requirements resulting from the short range renewal program. Specifically, the study was to include:

(1) An estimate of relocation needs of residents likely to be displaced by public action, including but not limited to urban renewal action, and identification of characteristics of families and individuals likely to be displaced including family size, income, minority group membership, and groups with special housing needs (e.g., the elderly);

(2) Estimates of the housing resources available to displaced families including the extent to which such available housing meets federal, state, and local criteria as to quality, cost, location, and other characteristics;

(3) An estimate of non-residential displacement including an evaluation of the factors affecting commercial and industrial displacements, and assessment of the availability of financial and other assistance to non-residential establishments to aid them in the relocation process.

The report which follows attempts to come to grips with each of these three sets of estimates. It will be noted that in most areas the available information is quite sketchy; 1970 census data is as yet incomplete (e.g., present unavailability of income data) or cannot be disaggregated to a level which will facilitate precise forecasts. In addition, programs which will

produce need for relocation are both tentative and subject to change as to whether they will be carried out, their scope, and their timing. Code enforcement programs present complexities beyond those of renewal programs in estimating relocation needs involving variables such as the number of building inspectors, number of complaints and neighborhoods emphasized for enforcement.

While operating agencies cooperated in the attempt to obtain realistic estimates of relocation needs and characteristics of relocatees, the scarcity of hard baseline information dramatized the information fog in which these agencies must frequently operate. Final quantitative projections should be interpreted for what they are and what this contract calls for--estimates, but estimates based on the best information available. Where possible or feasible, available relocation data have been meshed with non-relocation information; where standard interpretative formulae are useful, such have been superimposed upon the estimates to derive categoric breakouts for prospective relocatees. The contractor has utilized aggregate data (1970 census data in many cases, but in some cases soundest estimates) as the basis for projections. While methodologically more difficult to justify, this procedure had to be utilized if any useful data were to emerge. Internal controls were employed, where possible, to mitigate the influence of aggregate estimation errors.

RELOCATION STUDY

SUMMARY

As government commitment to fair relocation policies has substantially increased in recent years, relocation program concerns have shifted to a focus on increasing the standard housing supply and on utilizing the relocation process as a means of improving the lives of individuals. To meet the latter goal, it is recommended that the city's Centralized Relocation Agency intensify its relations with the neighborhood stations of the Human Development Corporation.

The level of standard housing units available to low-income persons in the St. Louis area is the single most important determinant in the ability of the city to successfully carry out a relocation program. This level depends on at least four trends: number of middle-income families vacating existing standard housing, increase in incomes by low-income families, increased federal appropriation for subsidized housing, and change of neighborhoods from predominantly white to predominantly black or integrated.

In the short range, it appears that displacement projections of currently-scheduled programs are substantially less than the number of new low- and moderate-income dwelling units to be built in the same period. As the table below shows, about 1,900 households will be displaced within the next five years, and about 10,500 new units will become available.

Housing Availability Compared to Housing Need for Relocation

Type of Housing Available	Projected Availability	Projected Need	Surplus (+) Deficit (-)
Elderly Turnkey			
First Two Years	601	47	+554
Next Three Years	620	42	+578
Five-Year Total	1,221	89	+1,132
Public Housing Vacancy and DCSCHR Projected Additions			
First Two Years	3,430	867	+2,563
Next Three Years	6,060	951	+5,109
Five-Year Total	9,490	1,818	+7,672

Any substantial increase in demolition of occupied units, however, may increase relocation needs. Further, the competition for the new housing units from persons living in the estimated 70,000 sub-standard units may mean that available standard units will not, in fact, be available at the actual time of relocation.

Four basic steps must be taken to increase the supply of standard housing: improving the income of the poor, increasing the level of Congressional appropriations, improving the housing subsidy processing mechanisms of HUD, and adopting a policy of fair housing throughout the metropolitan area.

Non-residential displacement is estimated to be about 900 firms over the next five years, and although precise data is not available, a large number of these are probably marginal, one or two-person operations. Special attention must be paid to those businesses which will be able to survive in a new location, such as modifying zoning policies forbidding commercial uses in new housing developments.

Of the estimated 2,600 families to be displaced over the next five years, it is estimated that about 50 per cent will be black, about 30 per cent will have incomes below \$300 a month, about 40 per cent will be in one- and two-person households, and about 10 per cent will be elderly.

RELOCATION STUDY
PROJECT 4-2
ST. LOUIS CRP

RATIONALE AND GOAL OF RELOCATION PLAN

"We seem to have reached a juncture where relocation as it is presently constituted, and when at its best, has adopted most of the basic improvements that are possible within its general purview. To be sure, marginal improvements can still be made. Among other things, financial benefits can be raised, social services can be expanded, and all relocation programs can be made uniform. With a few more improvements it can perform its secondary task of facilitating redevelopment reasonably well and at the same time provide some small measure of comfort to the displaced.

"But even with these improvements, relocation will remain largely a set of procedures to be followed, in a relatively uninfluential area of public activity.

"On the other hand, were the program reconstituted and elevated to a position of priority importance in the redevelopment proceed, it might readily be turned into a more positive program, designed primarily to provide real opportunity to the urban poor, and only secondarily to serve some other public purpose. That it is possible to think in terms of this second alternative is in itself indicative of the substantial advance the relocation program has made since its beginnings thirty years ago . . ."¹

As the above statement on relocation indicates, it appears that, at least nationally, many of the relocation program needs appearing as a result of urban renewal projects in the 1950's (wholesale clearance allegedly without substantial concern for relocation) are either being met or are in the process of being met. Put simply, because of the great concern about the problem of relocation as expressed by neighborhood residents, academics, publicists, civil rights groups and government officials, the relocation problem is being met in the 1960's in a more adequate way than it was in the 1950's.

¹Paul L. Niebanck, Relocation in Urban Planning: From Obstacle to Opportunity (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), p. 27. See also Robert P. Groberg, Centralized Relocation (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Housing and Renewal Officials, 1969).

The basic need for a relocation plan emanates from the principle that it is the proper obligation of government to assist those who have borne the brunt of community development. Traditionally, Federal regulations specifying this obligation were considered advisory, to be followed or discarded as necessary. Recently, however, the regulations have become mandatory for redevelopment projects; continuation of federal assistance has become dependent on strict compliance with such regulations and attendant minimum requirements.

One study suggests that the new emphasis resulted from judicially established principles which allow the courts to enforce these requirements. The principles, simply stated, are:

- (1) Relocation requirements are binding and not discretionary;
- (2) Fulfillment of relocation requirements is essential to recertification of a renewal plan;
- (3) Displaced persons have a judicially enforceable right to relocation assistance;
- (4) Displaced persons have standing to bring suit to enjoin an entire renewal project as illegal, based on inadequate provision for relocation.²

While the requirements of the Federal Government must be closely adhered to, administration of such responsibility is possible only through the local relocation staff, following the guidelines of a locally adopted plan and set of procedures. Since the original Work Program of the St. Louis Development Program (CRP) was drafted, the Centralized Relocation Division of the City has been established.³ This relocation function, as presently

²See Cahn, Eichenberg and Romberg, The Legal Lawbreakers--A Study of the Non-Administration of Federal Relocation Requirements, Clearinghouse Review, March 1971.

³Ordinance 55599 (March 24, 1970).

constituted, appears to meet Federally and judicially imposed criteria; evaluation of its success remains a point for future analysis.

A relocation plan, however, cannot restrict itself to the singular goal of finding suitable housing for displaced persons. No longer is it possible, either politically or legally, to provide only for minimal payments or services to those displaced. Indeed, under the Uniform Relocation Act of 1970,⁴ many of the reforms advocated over the years have been institutionalized into law, particularly those dealing with adequate payments for owner-occupants (public agencies must pay the replacement cost of housing) and for tenants (who become vested with certain rights as to relocation payments that a decade ago were vested only in their landlords).

Thus, the problem of meeting a broad range of relocation needs of those in renewal areas (and, indeed, of not even entering into such programs if the magnitude of relocation is to be major) has been generally recognized. Many cities (St. Louis included) are exhibiting this concern by centralizing and greatly enlarging their relocation agencies and attendant services.

But another problem remains. Those who advocated public concern for relocation assumed that if such concern could be institutionalized, housing was available into which relocated families could be moved. Moreover, it was fallaciously assumed that available housing was of standard quality and was within the income capability of the persons to be relocated. The only gap, it was held, was in ensuring that the public agencies would in fact make the effort at relocation.

⁴Public Law 91-646, December 18, 1970.

However, now that the effort at relocation is being made, it is becoming increasingly evident that the basic assumption of housing availability is somewhat tenuous. Thus, a successful relocation program, while retaining past reforms relating to protection of individual rights, must now also ensure that there is in fact adequate replacement housing. This criterion has been written into recent law for the urban renewal program.

The relocation program (or process) thus becomes one of ensuring housing availability--which means a program of constructing new or rehabilitating old housing. Often, such housing must be subsidized, simply because persons of low income cannot pay the rent required to amortize a new or rehabilitated subsidized dwelling unit. By a dollars and cents analysis, the private sector (unaided) cannot meet the relocation needs of those now living in substandard housing.

If the goal of ensuring that adequate housing is both available to and affordable by relocatees, it must also be recognized that this part of the relocation program is largely beyond the capability of a Relocation Agency, whether centralized or not. The factors affecting the availability of replacement housing are factors not within the control of a Relocation Agency--nor, for the most part, are they within the control of the city administration.

The level of available subsidized housing is a case in point. The basic determinant of the amount of available subsidized housing is the level of appropriations by the Congress of the United States. This level determines the number of new housing starts each year nation-wide--and thus, the system of allocation of such new starts to localities determines the number of

new available subsidized units, in each community each year. No series of conferences, reports, innovative ideas, commitment, or statements to the press at the local level can alter this basic fact: Congress largely determines the number of subsidized units available. At the current rate of Congressional authorization, it appears that St. Louis will be able to provide approximately 1500 new housing units each year,⁵ and the City and County together about 3500 units. Given the existence of 70,000 substandard units occupied by predominantly low income persons, at this rate of authorization, it will take approximately 47 years to eliminate substandard housing, assuming no other structures deteriorate in those two generations.

Relocation Process

The statements above concerning the two-part process of a relocation plan-- concern for assisting those displaced and the dependence of a relocation plan upon available and suitable (often subsidized) housing--are particularly applicable for the present relocation program in the City of St. Louis. The City took a large step forward in instituting the Division of Community Services and Centralized Housing Relocation (DCSCHR) within the Department of Welfare. For the first time, the City provided a central agency for all necessary relocation. This unit is available to all agencies who require relocation help, although some agencies, such as the Missouri State Highway Department, have not yet begun to use its services. In the period since its inception, the Division has trained a staff and established an operating plan for relocation. Presumably, families are being moved out of redevelopment areas and into adequate, safe, and affordable housing. Redevelopment programs

⁵St. Louis has about 3/10 of one percent of the nation's population; this would provide the city about 1500 units a year based on the approximate number of units currently being authorized. If the city and county are considered together (1,570,000), the share would be about 7/10 of one percent, or about 3500 units a year.

proceed without significant delay caused by relocation problems. It is now possible for relocation to become a major force in shaping the total lives of the relocatees and their neighborhoods.

Nonetheless, three major problems persist in relocation: 1) finding an adequate housing supply, 2) organizing and supervising the physical move of each relocatee, and 3) handling the sociological and psychological needs of the relocatees. Each of these problems is substantial but not insurmountable.

The Division recently adopted a Relocation Assistance Plan as a guide to the staff of DCSCHR. It follows the complete process of relocation, from planning the relocation of all families in the project to the minute details of each relocatee, concluding with the final settlement of the relocatee in his new dwelling. The first part of the Plan, setting forth the general standards for relocation, provides an excellent guide for the proper movement of any relocatee. Determinants of the suitability of relocation housing are obvious: non-discrimination, adequate physical occupancy standards, and affordable within the financial means of the family.

The section of the Plan dealing with Housing Standards is particularly crucial for the solution to each family's problems. This section requires the staff to provide the relocatee with housing which is 1) above specified physical standards, 2) within his ability to pay, and 3) convenient in terms of location. Although these standards are logical, a few remarks are in order. First, there is the question of whether the physical quality standard and the ability to pay standard should be rules or merely guidelines. These standards have immediate, direct, and obvious applicability to the Model City Neighborhoods. But as the program is expanded beyond the Model Neighborhood

and becomes applicable in other areas of the City, the problems of blight and poverty may not be so intense; the criteria of physical structure and income of the relocatee may not be as critical. For example, a family with income over \$10,000 may be willing and able to pay more for rent and utilities than the mandatory 25%. Also, no mention under location standards is made of neighborhood suitability. Even though offered housing is suitable by the other standards, the relocatee should have some option to reject it on the basis of neighborhood suitability.

The proposals for obtaining relocation housing emphasize that relocation of poor families does not necessarily mean relocation into public housing. If a family can maintain itself and desires to live outside the neighborhood of its old dwelling, it should be given every encouragement to do so. The condition and reputé of many public housing projects in Saint Louis mitigate against their use as even temporary relocation sites. Use of existing satisfactory public housing as temporary relocation sites also acts to the detriment of a sense of community within the projects themselves.

The guidelines for relations with site occupants are crucial to the future of relocation. Frequently, the only personal contact the relocatee will have with the developer will be through the staff of the relocation agency. This is the phase at which the Relocation Agency could be most useful, for here centralization has its greatest potential import. The matching of housing need with supply, provision of needed social services, certification of housing suitability, and assistance to self-relocating displaced persons can best be done on a city-wide basis. Also crucial is the planning and use of suitable housing for emergency temporary relocation.

Such use should be greatly restricted, since the policy of relocating twice wastes time and money, and burdens the displaced person to an excessive degree.

The final link in the relationship between the Relocation Agency staff and relocatees concerns the third major relocation problem, one which has not yet been faced by most relocation programs. This problem is providing non-relocation services to the relocatees, and involves two aspects. First, relocation, no matter how handled, tends to cause some disruption in the family unit. Social, psychological, and economic problems are likely to develop. Second, relocation means that many families may, for the first time, come into contact with welfare services. These two possibilities imply that the Department of Welfare (parent agency of the Relocation Agency) will be confronted with a marked increase in the number of people eligible for the whole spectrum of services. Besides providing informational assistance, it is possible that the Relocation Agency should provide many of these non-relocation social services to the relocatees. This may be accomplished in either of three ways.

(1) The Relocation Agency may make specific referrals to other divisions of the Department of Welfare, state or Federal welfare offices, or other government offices dealing with social problems.

(2) The Relocation Agency may provide these services itself, through an enlarged staff to include professionals in social and psychological services in addition to specialists in obtaining other government services for the relocatee.

(3) Where possible, utilization of the resources of the neighborhood centers of the Human Development Corporation.

We recommend that the third alternative be investigated for several reasons:

a) The expansion of the HDC centers as a resource to meet social and economic problems of families to be relocated will build on a base of already available social services.

b) In turn, this will avoid bureaucratic expansion within the Relocation Agency for the delivery of social services, and thus will avoid duplication of effort, reduce competition for relatively scarce social service personnel, and will allow continued emphasis by the Relocation Agency on its primary function: ensuring provision of services and a suitable dwelling unit to the family during the relocation period.

c) Use of HDC centers will also provide an opportunity for the family to become acquainted with the services of the neighborhood center leading to employment counseling, additional education, health or legal services, or family counseling. Because of the cross-reporting among neighborhood centers, a family may be referred to the neighborhood center in the area where they are being relocated. If a family moves into an area not served by the neighborhood center system, the referring neighborhood center could arrange necessary services from other community agencies. The basic objective is that a concentrated source of services would be available in the neighborhood where the family to be relocated lives.

Housing Supply

It was stressed in the introduction that a crucial element in a relocation plan is the assurance that adequate housing is available and open to meet the needs of those to be displaced by public action. Although the current status of such provision of housing will be sketched below, some preliminary remarks are in order.

First, it should be stressed that any housing available to persons displaced by public action will also be available (according to either the free market dictates of unsubsidized housing, or the legislative mandate of subsidized housing) to other persons who are also seeking housing. Unsubsidized housing obviously will be available to anyone who can pay the rent. Subsidized housing, however, is available to anyone who meets certain income guidelines, whether or not they are displaced by public action. The regulations governing public housing and the Sec. 235 and 236 subsidy programs (the three programs which constitute most of the federally-subsidized housing) provide that any person, whether displaced by public action or not, who is below a certain income is eligible for occupancy. Each law has a provision that persons displaced by public action are eligible regardless of income, but such does not change the fact that displaced persons are in competition for such housing units with all other persons below a certain income level in the metropolitan area.

A simple listing of the available housing supply today is not the same as a listing of the housing supply in fact available to persons to be relocated today. At any given point in time, it is possible that a number of low-income families, now living in housing not in the way of the public bulldozer, may decide to apply to available subsidized or non-subsidized housing. The fact that the Relocation Agency cannot know in advance what that number will be means that it cannot know in advance the number of dwelling units that will, in fact, be available when the time for relocation occurs.

Second, it should be stressed that there is another vehicle to provide standard housing for persons displaced by public housing over and above

construction of new housing. This is an increase in the vacancy rate of already-existing standard housing. We stress that there must be an increase in the vacancy rate in existing standard housing; without such an increase, placing a publicly-displaced family in a housing unit simply means that some other family did not get that housing unit. If the number of housing units required in the city is more than the number of standard units available, this simply means that the non-displaced person ends up in the ^{sub-}standard unit. One can argue that the displaced person has had his troubles (being forced to move) and, therefore, should get some benefit but such an approach does nothing to improve the overall quality of housing throughout the community.

The only ways to improve housing in the community are to preserve, rehabilitate or construct. No amount of shuffling people around will mean much, in the aggregate, if there are more families seeking housing than there are standard units available. In fact, one could state that to the extent the shuffling around process expends public resources, it represents a net decrease in housing quality city-wide, since it uses money that could otherwise go into the direct provision of new housing. On the other hand, if there are sufficient standard units available, but their existence is not known by the person to be relocated, and he, therefore, takes substandard housing and leaves standard housing vacant, a "shuffling" staff is justified.

The 1970 census lists approximately 220,000 households in St. Louis, while the housing census indicates only about 150,000 standard units. One can legitimately conclude that some 70,000 households are living in substandard units. The housing supply component of a relocation plan must concern itself with eliminating this 70,000 standard-unit disparity.⁶ Once done, the relocation

⁶This conclusion is presented in the City Plan Commission's A Housing Program for the City of St. Louis: 1970-1980, p. 6.

process would tend to become self-operating (persons will simply find a home) or, for those unable to do so on their own, a comparatively simple task for staff of the Relocation Agency to perform for them.

Eliminating this 70,000 standard-unit disparity can occur in a combination of ways:

--The number of middle-income families in the city may decrease, thereby increasing the stock of standard housing available to low income families.

--Some low-income families may increase their incomes, thus enabling them to afford middle-income dwelling units.

--The federal government may increase the level of appropriation for new subsidized housing and expand its processing staff to accelerate assistance to developers, thereby also accelerating the supply of new housing.

--More neighborhoods containing standard housing that are now predominantly white could change to predominantly black, and thus provide more standard housing for low-income blacks.

This report makes no effort to predict which of the above trends will predominate, although to some extent all of the trends will occur; however, if new middle class housing construction slows precipitously, the tendency for middle-income persons to leave the city will also slow resulting in less turnover of housing to low-income persons. Recent data on housing starts in St. Louis County gives evidence of rapid expansion; assuming a continued exodus of black and white middle class families, the stock of standard housing available to low income households should expand.

The foregoing analysis is intended to demonstrate that the degree to which the above four trends occur constitutes the basic determinant whether

or not a relocation program can be successful or not. Failing any direct influence upon the above trends, however, we turn to more mechanistic analysis of the relocation problem--comparing new projected housing starts to projected relocation needs.

Relocation Needs

Partly because St. Louis has not in fact undertaken large renewal projects in recent years, partly because of administrative problems, partly because large blighted areas of the city have been voluntarily abandoned, and partly because the Department of Housing and Urban Development has delayed approval of new programs, St. Louis' relocation problem is momentarily minimal.

What relocation that is required will largely be the result of housing code enforcement programs and highway construction. In the next two years, these activities will account for 69.3 percent of all relocation needs, and 74.3 percent in the next five years.

Total estimated relocation needs, based on current program planning and probable activities as estimated by agency representatives, are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1
Estimated Residential Relocation Needs for 2 and 5 Year Intervals,
By Program Producing Need*

Program	2 Year Total	Next 3 Years	5 Year Total
Model City--Housing Construction	308	-	308
DeSoto-Carr NDP	117	100	217
Code Enforcement (Model Neighborhood)	128	147	275
Code Enforcement (Building Division)	444	666	1,110
Mo. Highway Dept.	385	117	502
Urban Renewal--West End	50	33	83
Urban Renewal--LaSalle Park	80	243	323
Urban Renewal--Mill Creek North	-	85	85
Totals	1,512	1,391	2,903

Source: City of St. Louis Division of Community Services and Housing Relocation, Relocation Assistance Plan, January 20, 1971.

*Totals reflect mayoral decision approving only the southern portion of the I 755 distributor highway.

**Estimated figure as revised by Missouri Highway Department and the Office of the Mayor based on a re-survey; project area contains approximately 30% vacancy as of June 1, 1971.

These totals do not reflect (1) any programs which may be implemented by the acceptance of the legal-administrative recommendations submitted as a separate report to the City Plan Commission; (2) any relocation needs from recently-approved Chapter 353 developments, where relocation, especially in portions of the West End area, could be extensive; or (3) any programs not presently in the planning stage.

Characteristics of Displaced Households

The analysis which follows is an attempt to separate out the estimated 2,621 displaced households by percentage of elderly, by income and household size (thereby estimating size and rental price of units required), and by minority group membership. The quality of existing information on each of these characteristics varies considerably, necessitating extrapolations from Census data and other information sources. Assumptions governing the estimates thus obtained are provided. Information gaps will become apparent to the reader, but for the most part these are noted and overcome through assorted data manipulation techniques.

Elderly Households -- Utilizing U.S. Bureau of the Census data, approximately 15 percent of the persons living in the city of Saint Louis may be classified as elderly (age 65 or older). Because of the geographic location of the programs requiring relocation of households, a standard application of the 15 percent figure would probably result in distortions. Accordingly, each of the projects which will require relocation was superimposed on a census tract map, and relatively precise numbers of elderly were determined for each project area. These data are reported in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 2
Number of Elderly Households Displaced in Selected Time Intervals
By Project Producing Need

Relocation Project	2 Year Total	Next 3 Years	5 Year Total
Model City - Housing Construction ¹	3	-	3
DeSoto Carr NDP ¹	17	11	28
Code Enforcement (Model Neighborhood) ¹	14	16	30
Code Enforcement (Building Division) ¹	49	73	122
Mo. Highway Department - I 755 South ²	32	7	39
Federally Assisted Code Enforcement ¹	3	2	5
Urban Renewal - West End ³	4	2	6
Urban Renewal - LaSalle Park ⁴	15	29	44
Urban Renewal - Mill Creek North ⁴	-	12	12
Totals	137	152	289

¹Projection based on Census population by tract of 11% elderly.

²Projection based on Census population by tract of 10.5% elderly.

³Projection based on Census population by tract of 7.5% elderly.

⁴Projection based on Census population by tract of 12% elderly.

Application of the city wide figure of 15 percent produces an estimate of 199 elderly households displaced in two years and 198 in the subsequent three years, for a total of 397 over the five year interval. Utilization of the more precise census tract figures for the affected areas yields a somewhat lower figure for elderly relocation needs: 137 households in the first two years, 152 additional households in the following three year interval, and a five year total of 289 elderly households.

Family Size -- Estimation of family size for relocation households constitutes the most difficult of the data extrapolations attempted. Short of highly specialized surveys conducted in the affected areas for the precise purpose of determining household size, any data presented should be analyzed with some caution. Available information is in aggregate form only; census data that would supply a corrective feature are not as yet available. Consequently,

estimation procedures require the use of aggregate information in an attempt to establish the dimensions of specific household size categories; this has been accomplished by means of the data manipulation techniques described below.

The data on family size were derived in the following manner (refer to Table 3). The total number of households in the city according to the 1970 Census is 215,479; of these 2,621 are scheduled to be relocated. The breakdown of the household categories for the city as a whole is found in Column 1 of Table 3. A ratio between categories of household size to the total number of households in the city was constructed (Column 2 of Table 3). This ratio was then applied to the 2,621 households to be relocated; the resulting estimates of household size for relocatees can be found in Column 3 of Table 3.

To verify the validity of these relocation household size estimates, total population estimates of people to be relocated were utilized. The mean household size in each of the affected areas was established from Census tract data and was multiplied by the total number of households to be relocated in each area.⁷ This procedure yields a figure of 8,560 persons to be relocated. When household size is multiplied by the estimated number of relocation households in Table 3, a minimum number of persons to be relocated totals 7,296. It is obvious, therefore, that the aggregate estimation procedure in Table 3 is skewed disproportionately toward one and two person households. To narrow the divergence in the population figures, several corrective features based on additional information were employed.

⁷Mean household size for each of the affected areas appears in parentheses; total estimated population to be relocated in each area follows. Model City Construction (3.4), 102; DeSoto Carr NDP (3.2), 810; Code Enforcement--Model Neighborhood (3.4), 935; Code Enforcement--Building Division (3.3), 3663; Missouri Highway Department (3.4), 1261; Federally Assisted Code Enforcement (3.3), 142; Urban Renewal-West End (3.7), 307; Urban Renewal-LaSalle Park (2.9), 1076; and Urban Renewal-Mill Creek North (3.1), 264. Total = 8,560.

TABLE 3
Procedure for Estimating Household Size for Relocation Population

Household Size	Total, City Households	Ratio of Group to Total	Ratio Applied to Relocation Households	Relocation	
				Population Total From Ratio	Revised Estimate of Relocation Households
One Person	61,063	.283	742	742	618
Two Persons	64,578	.300	786	1,572	653
Three Persons	31,399	.145	380	1,140	570
Four Persons	21,799	.101	265	1,060	398
Five Persons	13,963	.065	170	850	250
Six Persons	8,797	.041	108	648	162
Seven Persons	6,190	.029	76	532	113
Eight or more	7,690	.036	94	752*	139
TOTALS	215,479	1.000	2,621	7,296*	2,903

*Population figure is a minimum number due to the expansive, residual category.

(1) The Missouri Highway Department re-survey of the affected area calculates the total population to be relocated at 965 persons, compared to the 1,261 persons estimated by the procedure noted in Footnote 7. This reduces the total expected number of persons to be relocated to 8,264.

(2) The number of one and two person households was reduced by one-fourth because of an overconcentration of white singles and pairs city wide, while such a concentration does not exist in the affected areas. Moreover, elderly concentrations (which are more likely to consist of one and two person households) do not appear in the affected areas (i.e., those needing relocation services), 15 percent city wide as opposed to 11% in the affected areas.

(3) The reduction in one and two person households alters the ratio of these two categories to the total from .583 to .437 and increases the ratio of all other categories from .417 to .563 of the total. This represents a thirty-five percent increase in all households larger than two persons; this increase was distributed evenly among all categories larger than two persons and yields the estimates of household size found in Column 5 of Table 3. Multiplying the household size estimates by the number of persons per household yields a total population figure of 8,448 compared to the estimated 8,264 based on census tract data. The overage is slightly more than two percent of the total. Given rounding errors and internal variance within individual estimate figures, this correction procedure yields an adequate estimate of the number of households to be relocated broken down by number of persons per household. Overall, these totals average 3.2 persons per household.

Minority Group Membership -- To derive meaningful estimates of minority group membership among the displaced households, census tract information was superimposed upon location maps for each of affected areas. In this manner reasonably close estimates of black-white-other households can be established. These data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Minority Group Characteristics of Relocates, By Project Area

Project Area	Households			Total
	Black	White	Other	
Model Neighborhood Area ¹	472	145	3	620
Code Enforcement (Build. Div.)	550	670	10	1,230
Mo. Highway Dept. (I755 South)	320	84	8	412
Fed. Assisted Code Enforcement	18	23	2	43
Urban Renewal-West End	85	7	1	93
Urban Renewal-LaSalle Park	130	278	4	412
Urban Renewal-Mill Creek North	54	36	3	93
Totals	1,629	1,243	31	2,903

Family Income -- Some indicator of income level can be found utilizing the data compiled by the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority (LCRA) of families recently relocated by that agency. LCRA reports the following family income level breakdowns:

Under \$100 per month	4%
\$100 - 200 per month	8%
\$200 - 300 per month	19%
\$300 - 400 per month	20%
\$400 - 500 per month	18%
Over \$500 per month	31%

Using these figures as comparable to those where relocation is due within the next five years (and assuming that the income differentials are evenly

¹Combined figure for all Model Neighborhood projects. The distribution of relocation households by minority group membership is estimated in the following percentage terms: black = 56.6%; white = 42.2%; and other = 1.2%.

distributed across the family characteristic categories), the following distribution of income by displaced households results. (See Table 5.) Unfortunately, 1970 Census data on income is not as yet available to corroborate the income level breakdown.

Table 5
Estimated Monthly Household Income of Relocates for Selected Time Intervals

Income (by month)	2-Year Total	Next 3 Years	5-Year Total
Under \$100	55	61	116
\$100 - 200	123	138	261
\$200 - 300	250	275	525
\$300 - 400	264	289	551
\$400 - 500	247	275	522
Over \$500	462	466	928
Totals	1,401	1,502	2,903

These income data will be utilized later for purposes of estimating the dimensions of subsidized housing required for relocatees: Turnkey units for the estimated 814 households having a monthly income of \$300 or less, and Section 235 - 236 housing for the 994 households having a monthly income of \$500 or less. In Table 6 (building on the estimates developed thus far) we have correlated the data on income, household size and age to derive subunits for analysis.

Table 6
Estimated Monthly Household Income of Relocates for Selected Time
Intervals Controlled for Age and Mean Size of Household

Income by Age, Household Size		2-Year Total	Next 3 Years	5-Year Total
<u>Elderly</u>				
	Under \$100	5	6	11
	\$100 - 200	11	12	23
	\$200 - 300	26	29	55
	\$300 - 400	27	31	58
	\$400 - 500	25	27	52
	Over \$500	43	47	90
	Totals	137	152	289

<u>Household Size</u>				
1-2 Persons:	Under \$100	22	24	46
	\$100 - 200	44	48	92
	\$200 - 300	105	113	218
	\$300 - 400	110	119	229
	\$400 - 500	100	107	207
	Over \$500	171	184	355
	Totals	552	595	1,147
3-4 Persons:	Under \$100	17	18	35
	\$100 - 200	34	36	70
	\$200 - 300	80	86	166
	\$300 - 400	84	91	175
	\$400 - 500	76	82	158
	Over \$500	130	140	270
	Totals	421	453	874
5-6 Persons:	Under \$100	7	8	15
	\$100 - 200	14	15	29
	\$200 - 300	34	37	71
	\$300 - 400	36	39	75
	\$400 - 500	32	35	67
	Over \$500	55	59	114
	Totals	178	193	371
7 or More Persons:	Under \$100	4	5	9
	\$100 - 200	9	9	18
	\$200 - 300	21	22	43
	\$300 - 400	22	24	46
	\$400 - 500	20	21	41
	Over \$500	35	37	72
	Totals	111	118	229

The income level of \$300 monthly, figuring 20% for rent, would yield \$60 a month for rent, payable by the family. At this income level and below, a public housing subsidy would be required to meet the differential between the approximately \$60 a month which can be paid by the relocatee and the approximately \$100 a month minimum required for standard housing in the City of St. Louis.

Thus a total of 391 public housing (turnkey) units are required in the next two years, 423 in the following three years, and 814 in the next five years to meet the needs of all displaced households with incomes under \$300 a month. Using the criteria of one bedroom units for the elderly and all other households of one to two persons, two-bedroom housing for three to four-person families, three-bedroom housing for five to six-person families, and four to five-bedroom housing for families of seven or more, the following categories of public housing (turnkey) should be made available to house relocatees.

Table 7
Public Housing (Turnkey) Units Required to House Relocatees,
By Number of Bedrooms Per Unit

Number of Bedrooms	First 2 Years	Next 3 Years	5-Year Total
One bedroom	171	185	356
Two bedroom	131	141	272
Three bedroom	55	60	115
Four and five bedroom	34	37	71
Total	391	423	814

Of course, this is the optimum necessary based on relocation estimates; some of this need may be satisfied by existing housing and need not represent

demand for new housing. Due to the rapid deterioration of existing structures, however, new housing is to be preferred. Again, these housing needs are based on the cited programmatic levels; any increase in relocation activity in the Model Neighborhood would require a substantially increased supply of three, four, and five-bedroom units.

The income level of \$300-\$500 a month, figuring twenty per cent for rent, would yield \$60-\$100 a month. This would be sufficient for Section 235 and Section 236 subsidized housing (the effect of the subsidy on the rent level is somewhat less than that of turnkey), with the probability of some rent supplement for those in the lower income range. A total of 480 Section 235 - 236 housing units are required in the next two years, 518 in the following three years, and 998 over the five-year period.

Using the identical bedroom requirements for varying household size as were employed for turnkey housing, we derive the following needs.

Table 8
Sections 235, 236 Units Required to House Relocates,
By Number of Bedrooms Per Unit

Number of Bedrooms	2-Year Total	Next 3 Years	5-Year Total
One bedroom	210	226	436
Two bedroom	160	173	333
Three bedroom	68	74	142
Four-five bedroom	42	45	87
Total	480	518	998

With income over \$500 a month, and an allocation of twenty per cent for rent, \$100 a month would be available for rent. We believe that the private housing market as now existing is sufficient to meet this need. It is probable,

however, that four and five-bedroom apartments will not be available within this price range. With family size over six persons, it is likely that such families could qualify for Sec. 235 and 236 housing. Therefore, we recommend that additional units be built for 95 of the 186 families earning over \$500 a month but who have five or more persons in the household; estimated requirements are:

	<u>2-Year Total</u>	<u>Next 3 Years</u>	<u>5-Year Total</u>
Four or five bedroom (§ 235-236)	38	57	95

In summary, therefore, provision should be made within the next five years for the following types of subsidized housing to meet the needs of displaced households.

	<u>2-Year Total</u>	<u>Next 3 Years</u>	<u>5-Year Total</u>
Elderly turnkey	42	47	89
Family turnkey	349	376	725
Elderly 235 or 236 housing	52	58	110
Family 235 or 236 housing	<u>466</u>	<u>517</u>	<u>983</u>
Total	909	998	1,907

Thus, there is a total need of 1,907 government-subsidized housing units to meet the estimated relocation needs of all families to be relocated by government action over the next five years; 909 of these units must be available within two years.

It should not be assumed, however, that this number will be the total relocation needs of the city during that period. According to the Relocation Agency, certain families will be displaced by eviction action of their private landlord. Some provision for relocation must be made for these families.

During the previous year (May, 1970-April, 1971) fifty-one households of this type were displaced.

On the other hand, a number of factors will reduce those who will have to be relocated through government assistance. Many will relocate voluntarily. Representatives of the Housing Authority estimate that up to twenty per cent of the households in a given area would relocate on their own responsibility. While this eases the work load of the agency in some respects, it does not actually reduce the number of units required. A few will die, particularly the elderly.

Thus, the operation of some natural forces will reduce the number to be relocated, and some natural factors will increase that number. Because of this, we recommend that the city designate the suggested number of new units as a minimum target for new housing in the city during the coming five years. We stress new housing; existing housing should not, where feasible, be used for relocation but should be made available to other persons within the city wishing improved housing.

Availability of Housing for Relocates

A critical element in a successful relocation process is the smooth transfer of households from the condemned unit into new quarters; the availability of standard housing at the time of relocation becomes an important component of a relocation study. Three sources of suitable housing are possible; government subsidized Turnkey and Section 235-236 units, vacancies in existing public housing projects, and the private market. Most of those households to be

relocated who possess a monthly income over \$500 will probably resort to the private sector for their relocation needs. Even though subject to seasonal variance, a random analysis of housing availability in the private sector suggests an adequate supply to serve the relocation needs of this particular population. Consequently, attention may be centered on the availability of housing for relocatees having a monthly income of less than \$500; the source of housing for this population is primarily government subsidized.

The Division of Community Services and Housing Relocation has prepared an estimate of additions to the supply of low and moderate income housing for the next five years. These estimates are reproduced in Table 9.

Table 9
Projected Additions to the Stock of Low and Moderate Income
Housing for 2 and 5-Year Intervals, By Source

Source	2-Year Total	Next 3 Years	5-Year Total
Model Housing and Development Corp. (CDP) (235-236)	600	1,400	2,000
Jeff-Vander-Lou Inc. (FHA 235j)	200	300	500
Public Housing	-	2,900	2,900
Public Housing--Leased Housing	275	450	725
Urban Renewal--West End	405	346	751
Urban Renewal--DeSoto-Carr	600	-	600
Urban Renewal--LaSalle Park*	300	300	600
Operation Breakthrough	416	-	416
Murphy-Blair Housing Corp. (CDP)	150	-	150
Chouteau-Russell (Mo 1-22--Mo 1-23)	120	-	120
Totals	3,066	5,696	8,762

*LaSalle Park data were provided by the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority and are in addition to the relocation agency's data.

In Table 10, the number of elderly Turnkey units in the city is provided according to the stage of completion; these data were obtained from the St. Louis Housing Authority.

Table 10
Number of Elderly Turnkey Units Available, By Stage of Completion

Stage of Completion	Number
Planning Stage	591
Construction Stage	160
Units Completed	470
Total	1,221

In Table 11, the average vacancy rate in existing public housing units is provided. These figures, broken down by bedroom size, were made available by the Saint Louis Housing Authority and managers of the individual projects.

Table 11
Average Vacancy Rate in Existing Public Housing, By Bedroom Size¹

Public Housing Project	Number of Bedrooms					Total
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	
Carr Square	5	0	0	0	*	5
Peabody	13	5	2	1	*	21
Vaughan	87	91	20	4	2	204
Vaughan Sr. Citizen	1	0	*	*	*	1
Darst	89	78	10	3	2	182
Webbe	40	72	11	9	*	132
Blumeyer	3	4	4	0	1	12
Cochran	43	47	15	1	1	107
Totals	281	297	62	18	6	664

Given these data on standard housing available for relocation purposes, a summary projection table may be constructed, and the data compared to the projected need for government subsidized housing as a result of relocation.

¹Data excludes the Pruitt-Igoe complex entirely and all other structures closed by the Housing Authority.

*No units provided of this size.

This comparison is provided in Table 12.

Table 12
Housing Availability Compared to Housing Need for Relocation

Type of Housing Available	Projected Availability	Projected Need	Surplus (+), Deficit (-)
Elderly Turnkey			
First Two Years	601	47	+554
Next Three Years	620	42	+578
Five-Year Total	1,221	89	+1,132
Public Housing Vacancy and DCSCHR Projected Additions			
First Two Years	3,430	867	+2,563
Next Three Years	6,060	951	+5,109
Five-Year Total	9,490	1,818	+7,672

With the exception of the majority of units in the Operation Breakthrough project, the housing available is for predominantly low and moderate income households. While Table 12 specifies a surplus of 7,672 units, this surplus relates only to the estimated needs for relocation and does not reflect any other activity which might result in the utilization of these units. In particular, it does not represent any attempt to reduce the number of households currently residing in substandard units. The surplus of 7,672 standard units represents only 10.9 per cent of the estimated 70,100 substandard units currently occupied. Moreover, the pool of substandard units may grow during the five-year period at a rate more than sufficient to offset the "gain". Since the occupants of the 70,100 substandard units tend also to be of low or moderate incomes, any programmatic acceleration geared to the rehabilitation or removal of the substandard units will have a near one to one relationship with relocation needs.

In summary, planned and existing subsidized housing will be adequate to meet relocation needs, given present program plans and assuming no major effort is geared to removing people from substandard units.

The most significant item about housing is that the speed of implementation and construction depends, not on the city, but on the Federal Government. If the Federal Government desires to improve the relocation plan of the city, the Federal Government should expedite approval of proposed subsidized housing construction in the City of St. Louis. As noted previously, most of the housing needs for relocation families can be met only by subsidized housing; the private sector finds it difficult to construct new housing for less than \$20,000 per unit, which translates into a monthly mortgage, taxes and insurance payment of approximately \$200 a month. Such requires an income of \$9,600 a year (based on federal standards of 25 per cent of income going for housing) well above the income level of most persons living in substandard housing.

This argument does not purport that some housing for the displaced cannot be provided by the private market; it does say that the private sector cannot be expected to provide the massive infusion of funds required to reduce the number of substandard units, unless the private sector can utilize Federal subsidy programs.

Non-Residential Displacement

Non-residential displacement offers some unique problems, as well as solutions, to the relocation process. Displacement of business is, comparatively stated, equally as severe as residential displacement. The displacement of a

business, especially a neighborhood business, is many times more disastrous economically than displacement of a family. Existing trade patterns are easily, and frequently permanently, disrupted. There are some mitigating circumstances, however, since economic loss only occurs with a thriving business. It is possible that the businesses in the redeveloping neighborhood are no longer viable or even economically feasible. Relocation could prove to be a boon for a business, especially if relocation puts the business into a newer neighborhood not far from his old location. It is to be hoped that zoning patterns in the areas of government subsidized housing will allow relocation of such displaced businesses. Nonetheless, it is impossible to estimate the impact of relocation upon businesses; some will survive, and some will fail. Categorical statements of the impact of non-residential displacement are value judgments, unsupported by hard corroborative data. Such displacements also have the potential to dramatically effect employment levels and municipal earnings and sales tax revenues.

If managerial propensity is lacking, the relocation agency may have the opportunity to provide remedial help and training. Therefore, not only relocation assistance but training assistance would be available to start the old business in a different neighborhood.

Federal money is controlled by The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1894) which guarantees to the owner of a displaced business (1) moving expenses, direct losses of personal property, expenses for searching for new location, or (2) average annual net earnings not to exceed \$10,000 if the business cannot be relocated.

Data on non-residential displacement were obtained from the LCRA and the Missouri Highway Department as well as other verification sources. The projected displacement figures are presented in Table 13. Of the 40 displacements specified by the Highway Department, ten constitute "significantly large" businesses or industries. The total of 900 displacements represents

Table 13
Non-Residential Displacement, By Program

Program	2-Year Total	Next 3 Years	5-Year Total
Code Enforcement (City)	228	324	552
Missouri Highway Dept.	53	50	103
Urban Renewal:			
DeSoto-Carr	61	99	160
West End	4	1	5
LaSalle Park	25	20	45
Mill Creek North	-	23	23
Total	371	517	888

27.3% of the total residential displacements, a ratio of roughly one to four. In relative terms, business and industrial displacement is more severe than residential. While the 3,295 displaced households represent only 1.5% of the 215,479 households in the city, the 900 displaced business and industrial units represent 7.5% of the 12,021 payroll reporting units as cited in the U.S. Department of Commerce report, 1969 County Business Patterns. Even though it is probable that the bulk of these dislocations constitute one or two-person operations (not to mention businesses in homes), the magnitude and impact of this datum should not be ignored. It is also interesting to note that Code Enforcement by the Building Commissioner's Office constitutes 61.3% of the dislocations.

Recommendations for Improvement of the Relocation Process

This report has described the relocation process as consisting of two elements: the provision of relocation assistance to those displaced by public action, and the assurance that standard units are available for relocatees. The following recommendations are for improvements in the process that now exists, rather than for totally new processes.

1. Improvement in the process of providing relocation assistance. The major improvement in this aspect is increased coordination of the relocation process with the provision of social services, including assistance in improving employability and education at expanded HDC neighborhood centers.

The Centralized Relocation Agency has not been in operation for a sufficient time to judge its effectiveness. We, therefore, propose that at the beginning of 1973 an in-depth review of the operation of that Agency be undertaken.

2. Improvement in the process of providing new housing. Essentially, these recommendations are contained in the Legal Administrative Report submitted separately. Any net increase in the number of standard units available to families of low and moderate income will, ipso facto, have the effect of improving the relocation process.

Therefore, the primary improvements in this aspect must be:

a) Programs to improve the incomes of low and moderate income families to allow them to afford existing standard housing. These recommendations, contained in the Socio-Economic study, are basically increased transfer payments for those unable to work, or increased job opportunities, job training or number of available jobs for those able to work.

Such programs are essentially a political decision of Congress. To the extent that greater federal resources are devoted to the problem of increasing the incomes of the poor, the more will the poor be able to afford standard housing, and the less acute will be the relocation problem.

b) The second improvement is also political--the determination by the Congress to increase the number of annual subsidized housing starts. As stated before, it is difficult for the private sector to provide housing for families earning below \$9,600 a year--a figure encompassing about two-thirds of the families in St. Louis.

c) The third improvement would be in the administrative process of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Too often these processes have been interrupted by the shifts and turns of national policy.

For the projected relocation needs of the next five years to be met, however, only item c) is necessary. HUD merely has to provide speedy approval of pending programs (this assumes that at least 40 per cent of the new dwelling units will in fact be available for relocated families).

3. Improvements in the process of turn-over of existing standard or near-standard housing to persons now of low-income. In many parts of the city, housing is available for prices between \$10,000 and \$15,000. Much of this provides a source of standard housing for low-income groups when the neighborhood changes from white to black--mostly by allowing middle-income blacks living in substandard housing to move into standard housing, and allowing low-income blacks to take the place of middle-income blacks in the substandard but still better housing than the low-income blacks held before.

Given the pattern of ghetto housing, the most practical means of improving the stock of available housing for low-income blacks is improving the ability of middle-income blacks to move into housing commensurate with their ability to pay. In fact, it has been this process of expansion of housing opportunities for middle-income blacks (mostly by extension of the ghetto, but to some extent by fair housing) that has been the major element in increasing the supply of standard housing to low-income blacks. In turn, this has probably been the main cause of the great increase in abandonment of very poor housing in the poorest of black neighborhoods.

To expedite this process of making standard housing available to all citizens, a metropolitan and ultimately a regional fair housing policy is needed and should be geared to achieving balanced, racially integrated neighborhoods.